



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,229	10/17/2001	Randy P. Stanley	INTL-0669-US (P12987)	5575

7590 07/13/2005

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/981,229

Applicant(s)

STANLEY, RANDY P.

Examiner

Paul Nguyen-Ba

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed 6/17/2005 in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/28/2005 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-15 are currently pending. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over QAS – QuickAddress Software (“QAS”), available at <http://www.qas.com> (circa December, 2000 via The Internet Archive Wayback Machine available at <http://www.archive.com>).

Independent Claims 1, 6, and 11

QAS teaches:

receiving address data (see pg. 2 – 4th paragraph → enables address data to be entered accurately and stored consistently in any database); and

comparing the address data to data in an independent database to determine the integrity of the data (see pg. 4 – 2nd paragraph; pg. 5 – 1st and 2nd paragraphs → compares and verifies address data against the national standard address databases, amending them where incorrect or incomplete and adding the missing elements to ensure accuracy), but does not specifically teach receiving address data *used with personal information management software*.

However, QAS teaches the reception of address data used with various underlying software applications (i.e. customer relationship management (Web, WAP phones), enterprise resource planning, or database applications) (see pg. 4 – 1st paragraph) for the purpose of helping users organize random bits of information.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that address data could be received from a personal information management software database for the purpose of for the purpose of helping users organize random bits of information.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to receive address data from an underlying software application such as a personal information management software database for the purpose of for the purpose of helping users organize random bits of information.

Claims 2, 7, and 12

QAS further teaches the method, system, article with respect to discussion above, but does not specifically teach including comparing the address data to data in a database on a processor-based system *that also stores said personal information management software*.

However, QAS teaches comparing the address data to data in a database on a processor-based system that also stores various database applications (see pg. 4 – 1st paragraph) for the purpose of helping users organize random bits of information.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that personal information management software can be stored in a processor-based system for the purpose of for the purpose of helping users organize random bits of information.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to store personal information management software in a processor-based system for the purpose of for the purpose of helping users organize random bits of information.

Claims 5, 10, and 15

QAS further teaches *automatically determining whether data sought to be entered into personal information management software is consistent with data stored in an independent database* (see pg. 4 – 2nd paragraph; pg. 5 – 1st and 2nd paragraphs → automatically compares and verifies address data against the national standard address databases, amending them where incorrect or incomplete and adding the missing elements to ensure accuracy).

5. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over QAS – QuickAddress Software (“QAS”), *available at* <http://www.qas.com> (*circa* December, 2000 *via* The Internet Archive Wayback Machine *available at* <http://www.archive.com>), in view of Adjaoute, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133721.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14

QAS teaches the method, system, article with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach including comparing the address data to data accessible *through a network*, such as *the Internet*. However, Adjaoute teaches use of the the iRAVES system (the Internet Real Time Address Verification Enterprise Service) developed by Intelligent Systems, Inc., of Washington, D.C. for the purpose of verifying postal addresses in real time via the Internet (see para [0013]).

Since QAS and Adjaoute are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Adjaoute would have been recognized in the pertinent art of QAS. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of QAS with the teachings of Adjaoute to include comparing the address data to data accessible *through a network*, such as *the Internet* for the express motivational purpose of comparing and verifying postal addresses in real time via the Internet.

Response to Arguments

6. It is noted that a decision has not been rendered regarding Applicant's affidavit filed on 4/28/2005.

7. A new reference date has been found independent of, and not based upon, Applicant's affidavit (see QAS – QuickAddress Software ("QAS"), available at <http://www.qas.com> (circa December, 2000)). In view of the newly referenced priority date, Applicant's affidavit is rendered moot.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB

William I Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/10/2005